

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 4, 11-13, and 18-20 are cancelled and claims 1, 8, 15, and 16 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 14-17 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,821,929, in view of Irons, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,427,032. (Examiner's Action, page 3, ¶ 1).

In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

Irons does not disclose any means for locating a keyword field within a document image. Irons only discloses that information from an image of a label is extracted. Nothing disclosed in Irons indicates how the label is found within the image.

Shimizu discloses that character regions are identified, average character sizes of the character regions are compared with one another, and a character region having the largest average character size is specified as a region from which character strings are drawn for use as keywords. The region from which the character strings are drawn, for use as keywords, is the keyword field. Therefore, Shimizu discloses locating a keyword field by identifying the region with the largest average character size. Shimizu additionally discloses using the location of the region to identify the keyword field. Shimizu does not disclose detecting a graphic image, wherein the graphic image is a field indicator, and locating a keyword field relative to the graphic image.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, include wording that a graphic image is detected as a field indicator and a keyword field is located relative to the graphic image. Neither Shimizu nor Irons discloses either a graphic image as a field indicator or locating a keyword field relative to the graphic image.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Jacklyn M. Dowdy

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 09/14/2005
(719) 260-7900